exception to the rulemaking provisions of 5 U.S.C. 553(a)(1).

Sincerely,

D. Michael Hutchinson,

Acting Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

[FR Doc. 95–25191 Filed 10–10–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DR-F

Adjustment of Import Limits for Certain Cotton and Man-Made Fiber Textile Products Produced or Manufactured in Mauritius

October 4, 1995.

AGENCY: Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements (CITA).

ACTION: Issuing a directive to the Commissioner of Customs adjusting limits.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 11, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Jennifer Aldrich, International Trade Specialist, Office of Textiles and Apparel, U.S. Department of Commerce, (202) 482–4212. For information on the quota status of these limits, refer to the Quota Status Reports posted on the bulletin boards of each Customs port or call (202) 927–5850. For information on embargoes and quota re-openings, call (202) 482–3715.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Authority: Executive Order 11651 of March 3, 1972, as amended; section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1854).

The current limit for Categories 338/339 is being increased for swing and carryforward, reducing the limit for Categories 638/639 to account for the swing being applied.

A description of the textile and apparel categories in terms of HTS numbers is available in the CORRELATION: Textile and Apparel Categories with the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (see Federal Register notice 59 FR 65531, published on December 20, 1994). Also see 60 FR 17333, published on April 5, 1995.

The letter to the Commissioner of Customs and the actions taken pursuant to it are not designed to implement all of the provisions of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act and the Uruguay Round Agreement on Textiles and Clothing, but are designed to assist only in the implementation of certain of their provisions.

D. Michael Hutchinson.

Acting Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements

October 4, 1995.

Commissioner of Customs, Department of the Treasury, Washington, DC 20229.

Dear Commissioner: This directive amends, but does not cancel, the directive issued to you on March 30, 1995, by the Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements. That directive concerns imports of certain cotton, wool, man-made fiber, silk blend and other vegetable fiber textiles and textile products, produced or manufactured in Mauritius and exported during the twelve-month period which began on January 1, 1995 and extends through December 31, 1995.

Effective on October 11, 1995, you are directed to amend the directive dated March 30, 1995 to adjust the limits for the following categories, as provided for under the Uruguay Round Agreements Act and the Uruguay Round Agreement on Textiles and Clothing:

Category	Adjusted twelve-month limit 1
Levels not in a group 338/339	457,763 dozen. 355,461 dozen.

¹The limit has not been adjusted to account for any imports exported after December 31, 1994.

The Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements has determined that these actions fall within the foreign affairs exception to the rulemaking provisions of 5 U.S.C. 553(a)(1).

Sincerely,

D. Michael Hutchinson,

Acting Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

[FR Doc. 95–25193 Filed 10–10–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DR-F

Adjustment of Import Limits for Certain Cotton and Man-Made Fiber Textile Products Produced or Manufactured in Pakistan

October 4, 1995.

AGENCY: Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements

(CITA).

ACTION: Issuing a directive to the Commissioner of Customs adjusting limits.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 11, 1995. **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ross Arnold, International Trade Specialist, Office of Textiles and Apparel, U.S. Department of Commerce, (202) 482– 4212. For information on the quota status of these limits, refer to the Quota Status Reports posted on the bulletin boards of each Customs port or call (202) 927–6714. For information on embargoes and quota re-openings, call (202) 482–3715.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Authority: Executive Order 11651 of March 3, 1972, as amended; section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1854).

The current limits for certain categories are being adjusted, variously, for swing, special shift and carryforward.

A description of the textile and apparel categories in terms of HTS numbers is available in the CORRELATION: Textile and Apparel Categories with the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (see Federal Register notice 59 FR 65531, published on December 20, 1994). Also see 60 FR 9014, published on February 16, 1995.

The letter to the Commissioner of Customs and the actions taken pursuant to it are not designed to implement all of the provisions of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act and the Uruguay Round Agreement on Textiles and Clothing, but are designed to assist only in the implementation of certain of their provisions.

D. Michael Hutchinson,

Acting Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements

October 4, 1995.

Commissioner of Customs, Department of the Treasury, Washington, DC 20229.

Dear Commissioner: This directive amends, but does not cancel, the directive issued to you on February 13, 1995, by the Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements. That directive concerns imports of certain cotton and manmade fiber textile products, produced or manufactured in Pakistan and exported during the twelve-month period beginning on January 1, 1995 and extending through December 31, 1995.

Effective on October 11, 1995, you are directed to adjust the limits for the following categories, as provided under the Uruguay Round Agreements Act and the Uruguay Round Agreement on Textiles and Clothing:

Category	Adjusted twelve-month limit ¹
239 313/226	968,144 kilograms. 94,733,759 square
314	meters. 3,873,681 square meters.
338	5,183,252 dozen.

Category	Adjusted twelve-month limit ¹
351/651	264,903 dozen. 818,279 numbers. 3,456,322 numbers. 42,897,244 numbers. 2,098,183 kilograms. 9,791,519 kilograms. 640,590 kilograms. 121,255 dozen.

¹The limits have not been adjusted to account for any imports exported after December 31, 1994.

31, 1994. ²Category 369–F: only HTS number 6302.91.0045; Category 369–P: only HTS numbers 6302.60.0010 and 6302.91.0005.

³ Category 369–R: only HTS number 6307.10.2020.

⁴ Category 369–S: only HTS number 6307.10.2005.

The Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements has determined that these actions fall within the foreign affairs exception to the rulemaking provisions of 5 U.S.C. 553(a)(1).

Sincerely,

D. Michael Hutchinson,

Acting Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements. [FR Doc. 95–25192 Filed 10–10–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DR-F

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Air Force

Notice of Extension—Final Environmental Impact Statement for Alaska Military Operations Areas

The comment period for the Alaska Military Operation Areas (MOAs) Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is extended for an additional 30 days. The new closing date for receipt of comments is November 10, 1995. Please send any written comments to 611 ASG/ LGV, 6900 9th Street, Suite 361, Elmendorf AFB, AK 99506-2270. For further information, please contact the Alaska MOA EIS Team between the hours of 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, at (907) 552-4151 (voice line) or fax comments to (907) 552-0170. A 24-hour answering machine can be reached at 1-800-538-6647.

Patsy J. Conner,

Air Force Federal Register Liaison Officer. [FR Doc. 95–25075 Filed 10–10–95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3910–01–P

Final Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Demolition of Historic Facilities at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH

The United States Air Force (Air Force) announces its intent to prepare

an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to assess the potential environmental impacts of the proposed demolition of multiple historic facilities eligible for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base (WPAFB), Ohio. It is anticipated that the proposed action and alternatives would impact the following resources: Cultural resources (specifically, historic properties), health and safety issues (e.g., asbestos and lead-based paint), socioeconomics, visual resources, land use, transportation (including parking), air quality, and noise. The EIS will provide the decisionmakers and the public with the information required to understand the future consequences of the proposed action and alternatives.

Due to defense cutbacks, military installations are being required to reduce the number of square feet of base facilities. In addition, any military construction of new facilities must be offset by a reduction in the square footage of existing buildings. An ongoing program to reduce excess square footage is in effect at WPAFB. This program addresses a total of 54 facilities that have been proposed for demolition through the year 2000.

The base contains a number of significant cultural resources, including the Huffman Prairie Flying Field, a portion of the Dayton Aviation Heritage National Historical Park, and five potential National Historic Districts. Three of these districts, the Fairfield Air Depot Historic District (FADHD), the Wright Field Historic District (WFHD), and the Army Air Forces Historic District (AAFHD) contain the facilities proposed for demolition. The FADHD includes the original 40-acre tract of land for the World War I Fairfield Air Depot that represents the earliest military presence at what is now WPAFB, and a portion of adjacent Wilbur Wright Field, which was leased by the government during the war and later became part of the combined Fairfield Air Depot complex. The WFHD includes the original Wright Field complex, constructed between 1926 and 1931, that served as headquarters for the Materiel Division of the U.S. Army Air Corps. The AAFHD was constructed between 1941 and 1945 in support of World War II mobilization and includes expanded wartime flying, modification, testing, and maintenance facilities.

Of the 54 facilities considered for demolition under the ongoing program at WPAFB, 23 facilities are potentially eligible for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places. The structures will be evaluated for impacts resulting from the proposed action and reasonable alternatives. It is anticipated that the cumulative impacts of past and proposed future facility demolition will result in significant adverse impacts to base cultural resources, and particularly to the three historic districts.

Alternatives to the proposed demolition under consideration include:

Alternative 1—No Action Alternative

The buildings would be retained in their current capacity and would be maintained and utilized in a manner similar to their present use.

Alternative 2—Adaptive Reuse

This alternative would consist of altering the existing use of the facilities and either returning the facilities to their original use or adapting the facilities for suitable alternative use. Many of the historic facilities are no longer used for the function for which they were constructed.

Alternative 3—Mothballing

This alternative is included in a category of alternatives known as "banking the facilities," whereby buildings are vacated but preserved for future use. Mothballing would include documenting the significant features, conducting a condition assessment, stabilizing and securing the building, providing adequate ventilation to the interior, securing utilities and mechanical systems, and developing and implementing a maintenance and monitoring plan.

Alternative 4—Stabilization

This alternative is a type of "banking" alternative. Stabilization would involve stabilizing the structure (e.g., bracing, reinforcement), turning off utilities, controlling pests by securing outside openings, securing the exterior from moisture penetration, providing periodic monitoring, and developing a minimal maintenance plan.

Alternative 5—Pickling

This alternative is a type of "banking" alternative. Pickling would consist of turning off all utilities, with no environmental controls.

Alternative 6—Combination of Alternatives

Under this alternative, a combination of the alternatives above (demolition, no action, adaptive reuse, and banking) would be implemented. Some buildings would be demolished while others could be reused, banked for possible future use, or continued in their current use.

To provide a forum for public officials and the community to provide